

ANNA M. DILONARDO

OFFICE MANAGING ATTORNEY
CO-CHAIR, ASBESTOS AND MASS TORT LITIGATION
SHAREHOLDER



AREAS OF PRACTICE

Asbestos & Mass Tort Litigation

CONTACT INFO

(631) 227-6346
AMDilionario@mdwgc.com

175 Pinelawn Road
Suite 250
Melville, NY 11747

ADMISSIONS

New York
1995

U.S. District Court Eastern District
of New York
1995

U.S. District Court Southern
District of New York
1995

U.S. District Court Northern District
of New York
1995

EDUCATION

University of Cincinnati College of
Law (J.D., 1988)

University of Cincinnati (B.B.A.,
1985)

ASSOCIATIONS & MEMBERSHIPS

Medical Defense Group, New York
County (Case Management
Committee)

YEAR JOINED

2011

OVERVIEW

Anna DiLionardo is a member of the Asbestos Litigation Practice Group and a member of the firm's Board of Directors. Her practice is devoted primarily to the defense of companies in asbestos litigation and she has appeared in both state and federal courts throughout the state of New York. She has extensive trial experience and has tried a multitude of cases on behalf of a vast array of companies over the past twenty years.

Anna has represented both large and small companies. These companies have run the gamut from manufacturers of asbestos-containing materials to small supply houses to premises owners. While Anna has extensive experience in the courtroom, negotiating a settlement is often the most economical way to resolve a dispute. She is well respected as a litigator and her skills as a negotiator are often sought to help resolve cases for clients throughout the country.

Her long tenure in the New York asbestos litigation has given her considerable insight and experience. She has served on numerous committees and acts as a liaison counsel to the court and Special Master. Her assistance is often sought to help negotiate general litigation procedures with plaintiff counsel. She was a founding member of the Medical Defense Group in New York County and continues as a member of this advisory group. In addition, she was appointed to the Case Management Committee and has been involved in the drafting of the Case Management Order for New York County. These positions, as liaison and in her service on committees, has allowed her to be at the forefront of decisions by the court and Special Master with regard to issues ranging from the amendments to the Case Management Order to setting cases for trial.

Anna has lectured and written extensively on various topics in the asbestos arena and her counsel is often sought with regard to the handling and history of the active docket in New York.

THOUGHT LEADERSHIP

On the Pulse...Our Long Island, New York Office

Long Island, NY – Melville
September 1, 2021

Ten years ago, a small group of lawyers and an amazing team of support sta Defense Digest, Vol. 27, No.

RESULTS

After nine-week trial, unanimous defense verdict in asbestos case where \$40 million in damages had been sought.

Asbestos & Mass Tort Litigation

March 23, 2022

We obtained a unanimous defense verdict after a nine-week trial in Suffolk County, New York, where the plaintiff's counsel requested that the jury award \$40 million in damages. The plaintiff was 51 years old when she was diagnosed with peritoneal mesothelioma, allegedly as a result of being exposed to asbestos-containing joint compound manufactured and sold by our client. The plaintiff, who was 56 at the time of trial, testified that she had little or no knowledge of ever being exposed to asbestos.

SIGNIFICANT REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Obtained a unanimous defense verdict after a nine week trial in Suffolk County, New York, where the plaintiff's counsel requested that the jury award \$40 million in damages. The plaintiff was 51 years old when she was diagnosed with peritoneal mesothelioma allegedly as a result of being exposed to asbestos containing joint compound manufactured and sold by our client. Plaintiff who was 56 at the time of trial, testified that she had little or no knowledge of ever being exposed to asbestos. However, her older sister, who served as the only product identification witness at trial, testified that she recalled that their father used asbestos containing joint compound on two occasions, approximately fifty years ago when he repaired their home after a fire in 1970 and when he built a home in Florida around 1975. Plaintiff was five and ten years old respectively during the alleged exposures and plaintiff's sister was seven years older. Plaintiff's sister testified that she had a vivid memory of her father using six different joint compounds during the two projects, including our client's product. She also testified that the plaintiff was present hundreds of times when their father mixed, applied and sanded the joint compound. At trial, we called an industrial hygienist, a toxicologist and an epidemiologist who testified that the type of asbestos fiber used in our client's joint compound did not cause or contribute to her mesothelioma, because the fibers are too short and do not cause disease. Our epidemiologist testified that plaintiff's mesothelioma developed spontaneously and was not the result of asbestos exposure. We also called a construction expert, who testified that the sister's testimony regarding the amount of joint compound used and the time the sister was exposed were excessive. The jury deliberated an hour before returning the verdict. Post-trial comments from jurors indicated they did not find the sister to be credible.